UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,930	07/29/2003	Norman R. Peterson	790419.90058	7513

26710   7590   04/07/2008
QUARLES & BRADY LLP
411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE
SUITE 2040
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497

EXAMINER
NORTON, JENNIFER L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/628,930	PETERSON ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Jennifer L. Norton	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 July 2003</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 July 2003</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-30 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 16, 23, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph,

as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4.   Regarding claim 23, the phrase "generally" renders the claim indefinite because

it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed

invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

5.   The following claims recite the limitations:

   • Claims 16 and 29 recites "the batches" in line 2.

   • Claims 27 recites "the operator interface" in line 2.

   There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
> use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
> States.

6.   Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13, 16-18, 20-22, 26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate by U.S. Patent No. 4,525,071 (hereinafter Horowitz).

7.   As per claim 1, Horowitz discloses a batching system for controlling ingredients

that are manually added to a batch via at least one transfer container, wherein the

ingredients include reconciled ingredients and unreconciled ingredients that are initially

disposed in origin containers, the system comprising:

        a first sensor (Fig. 5, element 346; i.e. load cell) for measuring an amount of an

ingredient in a container (col. 5, lines 44-49 and Fig. 3, element 4);

        a second sensor (Fig. 5, element 352; i.e. bar code scanner) for identifying an

ingredient in a container (col. 5, lines 5-11 and 62-67 and col. 6, lines 1-7); and

        a computer (Fig. 3, element 321) communicating (Fig. 3, element 387) with the

first and second sensors (col. 5, lines 32-34 and 39-49) and having a user interface

(col. 4, lines 24-30; i.e. receiving input from the user), wherein the computer executes

a stored program (col. 6, lines 51-54) configured to:

                i. identify a quantity (col. 5, lines 32-34) and identity of a reconciled

        ingredient (col. 5, lines 32-34; i.e. a first ingredient of a solid) to be added to the

        batch from a recipe (col. 6, lines 51-54 and col. 7, lines 41-50);

                ii. verify the origin container of the ingredient identified in (i) (col. 5, lines

        62-67, col. 6, lines 1-7 and 63-67 and col. 7, lines 1-19);

                iii. measure a quantity related to the origin container of the reconciled

        ingredient before the ingredient is added to the batch (col. 5, lines 47-48; i.e.

the quantity related to the origin container is continuously measured by load

cell); and

iv. measure and log the quantity related to the origin container of the

reconciled ingredient after the ingredient is added to the batch (col. 5, lines 44-

48; i.e. the quantity related to the origin container is continuously measured by

load cell).

8.   As per claim 2, Horowitz discloses the first sensor comprises a scale (col. 5, lines

44-49 and Fig. 5, element 346; i.e. load cell).

9.   As per claim 3, Horowitz discloses the quantity related to the origin container is a

weight (col. 5, lines 47-48).

10.   As per claim 7, Horowitz discloses the stored program is further configured to:

v. identify a quantity (col. 5, lines 32-34 and 44-49 and Fig. 3, element 4) and

identity (col. 5, lines 5-11 and 62-67 and col. 6, lines 1-7) of an unreconciled ingredient

(col. 3, lines 15-24, col. 4, lines 36-39 and col. 5, lines 21-25; (i.e. a second ingredient

of a liquid) to be added to the batch from the recipe (col. 6, lines 51-54 and col. 7, lines

41-50); and

vi. measure the quantity of the transfer container receiving the unreconciled ingredient after the unreconciled ingredient is added to the batch (col. 5, lines 44-48; i.e. the quantity related to the origin container is continuously measured by load cell).

11.   As per claim 8, Horowitz discloses the transfer container is identified prior to the reconciled ingredient being added to the batch (col. 7, lines 7-9; i.e. the transfer container is identified via Fig. 4, element 342).

12.   As per claim 9, Horowitz discloses the stored program is further configured to map a predetermined order in which the ingredients are to be added to the batch (col. 7, lines 45-54).

13.   As per claim 13, Horowitz discloses the multiple batches are prepared simultaneously (col. 4, lines 45-47 and Fig. 1).

14.   As per claim 16, Horowitz discloses a mixing station (Fig. 2, element 99-113) integrated with the batching system for mixing the batches with bulk ingredients (col. 9, lines 27-43).

15.   As per claim 17, Horowitz discloses an inventory monitoring station receiving data obtained by the first and second sensors for tracking a quantity of available origin

containers (col. 4, lines 35-39 and col. 62-67; i.e. the inventory monitoring station logs

a determined total number of origin containers (Fig. 1, element 1-80) and tracks the

contents of origin container with a bar code, hence the monitoring station tracks the

available number of origin containers since it functions to track the contents of each

origin container).

16.   As per claim 18, Horowitz discloses a business method for controlling ingredients

that are manually added to a batch via at least one transfer container, the method

comprising:

        A) providing a plurality of ingredients including reconciled (col. 5, lines 32-34; i.e.

a first ingredient of a solid) and unreconciled ingredients (col. 3, lines 15-24, col. 4,

lines 36-39 and col. 5, lines 21-25; i.e. a second ingredient of a liquid) disposed in

corresponding origin containers (col. 5, lines 44-49 and Fig. 3, element 4);

        B) providing a first sensor (Fig. 5, element 346; i.e. load cell) for measuring an

amount of an ingredient in a container (col. 5, lines 44-49 and Fig. 3, element 4);

        C) providing a second sensor (Fig. 5, element 352; i.e. bar code scanner) for

identifying an ingredient in a container (col. 5, lines 5-11 and 62-67 and col. 6, lines 1-

7); and

        D) providing a computer (Fig. 3, element 321) communicating (Fig. 3, element

387) with the first and second sensors (col. 5, lines 32-34 and 39-49) and having a user

interface (col. 4, lines 24-30; i.e. receiving input from the user), wherein the computer

executes a stored program (col. 6, lines 51-54) that:

       i. identifies a quantity (col. 5, lines 32-34) and identity of a reconciled

      ingredient (col. 5, lines 32-34; i.e. a first ingredient of a solid) to be added

      to the batch from a recipe (col. 6, lines 51-54 and col. 7, lines 41-50);

       ii. verifies the origin container of the ingredient identified in (i) (col. 5,

      lines 62-67, col. 6, lines 1-7 and 63-67 and col. 7, lines 1-19);

       iii. measures a quantity related to the origin container of the reconciled

      ingredient before the ingredient is added to the batch (col. 5, lines 47-48; i.e.

      the quantity related to the origin container is continuously measured by load

      cell); and

       iv. measures and logs the quantity related to the origin container of the

      reconciled ingredient after the ingredient is added to the batch (col. 5, lines 44-

      48; i.e. the quantity related to the origin container is continuously measured by

      load cell).

17.   As per claim 20, Horowitz discloses the stored program further:

      v. identifies a quantity (col. 5, lines 32-34 and 44-49 and Fig. 3, element 4) and

identity (col. 5, lines 5-11 and 62-67 and col. 6, lines 1-7) of an unreconciled ingredient

(col. 3, lines 15-24, col. 4, lines 36-39 and col. 5, lines 21-25; (i.e. a second ingredient

of a liquid) to be added to the batch from the recipe (col. 6, lines 51-54 and col. 7, lines

41-50); and

        vi. measures the quantity of the transfer container receiving the unreconciled

ingredient after the unreconciled ingredient is added to the batch (col. 5, lines 44-48;

i.e. the quantity related to the origin container is continuously measured by load cell).

18.   As per claim 21, Horowitz discloses transfer container is identified prior to the

reconciled ingredient being added to the batch (col. 7, lines 7-9; i.e. the transfer

container is identified via Fig. 4, element 342).

19.   As per claim 22, Horowitz discloses the stored program further maps a

predetermined order in which the ingredients are to be added to the batch (col. 7, lines

45-54).

20.   As per claim 26, Horowitz discloses preparing multiple batches of the same

ingredient simultaneously (col. 4, lines 45-47 and Fig. 1).

21.   As per claim 29, Horowitz discloses integrating the batching system with a mixing

station (Fig. 2, element 99-113) integrated for mixing the batches with bulk ingredients

(col. 9, lines 27-43).

22.   As per claim 30, Horowitz discloses tracking a quantity of controlled ingredients

(col. 4, lines 35-39 and col. 62-67; i.e. the inventory monitoring station logs a

determined total number of origin containers (Fig. 1, element 1-80) and tracks the

contents of origin container with a bar code, hence the monitoring station tracks the

available number of origin containers since it functions to track the contents of each

origin container).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

23.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented
> and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

24.   Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Horowitz.

25.   As per claim 4, Horowitz does not expressly teach within the same embodiment

of the specification the second sensor comprises a bar code scanner operable to read

bar codes disposed on each origin container containing a reconciled ingredient.

         Horowitz teaches to a second sensor comprises a bar code scanner operable to

read bar codes disposed a container containing a reconciled ingredient.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include the embodiment of a second sensor comprises a bar code scanner operable to read bar codes disposed a container containing a reconciled ingredient to provide automated inventory control batch weighing, and delivery of a large number of ingredients to a batch blender thereby reducing manual labor; and improved quality assurance, reduced fugitive losses of ingredients, cleaner operation and reduced health hazards (col. 3, lines 35-43).

26.   As per claim 5, Horowitz teaches as set forth above the bar code scanner (Fig. 4, element 342) is operable to read bar codes disposed on each transfer container (col. 7, lines 7-9).

27.   Claims 6, 15, 19 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,487,603 (hereinafter Hoff)

28.   As per claim 6, Horowitz does not expressly teach the stored program is further configured to verify that the measured quantity during (iii) is within a tolerance of a previously logged quantity.

Hoff teaches the stored program is configured to verify that the measured quantity is within a tolerance of a previously logged quantity (col. 18, lines 38-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include the stored program is configured to verify that the measured quantity is within a tolerance of a previously logged quantity to accurately and continuously account for the types and quantities of stored and used micro-ingredients (col. 1, lines 54-59).

29.   As per claim 15, Horowitz teaches the stored program is further configured to track origin containers of those reconciled ingredients that are controlled ingredients (col. 5, col. 32-33 and col. 6, lines 55-57).

Horowitz does not expressly teach a program configured to track lot numbers.

Hoff teaches to a program configured to track lot numbers (col. 6, lines 11-22, col. 17, lines 41-53, col. 18, lines 62-67 and col. 19, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include a program configured to track lot numbers to accurately and continuously account for the types and quantities of stored and used micro-ingredients (col. 1, lines 54-59).

30.   As per claim 19, Horowitz does not expressly teach the stored program further verifies that the measured quantity during (iii) is within a tolerance of a previously logged quantity.

Hoff teaches verifying that the measured quantity is within a tolerance of a previously logged quantity (col. 18, lines 38-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include verifying that the measured quantity is within a tolerance of a previously logged quantity to accurately and continuously account for the types and quantities of stored and used micro-ingredients (col. 1, lines 54-59).

31.   As per claim 28, Horowitz teaches tracking origin containers of those reconciled ingredients that are controlled ingredients (col. 5, col. 32-33 and col. 6, lines 55-57).

Horowitz does not expressly teach tracking lot numbers.

Hoff teaches to tracking lot numbers (col. 6, lines 11-22, col. 17, lines 41-53, col. 18, lines 62-67 and col. 19, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include tracking lot numbers to accurately and continuously account for the types and quantities of stored and used micro-ingredients (col. 1, lines 54-59).

32.   Claims 14, 15, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Horowitz in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0200130

(hereinafter Kall).

33.   As per claim 14, Horowitz does not expressly teach the stored program is further

configured to display messages via the user interface to an operator regarding the

identity and quantity of a next ingredient to be added.

      Kall teaches to displaying messages via the user interface to an operator

regarding the identity and quantity of a next ingredient to be added (pg. 11, par.

[0199] and Fig. 43).

      Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include

displaying messages via the user interface to an operator regarding the identity and

quantity of a next ingredient to be added to provide basic tracking, genealogy and

quality control of inventory and product (pg. 11, par. [0197]).

15. As per claim 15, Horowitz teaches the stored program is further configured to track

origin containers of those reconciled ingredients that are controlled ingredients (col. 5,

col. 32-33 and col. 6, lines 55-57).

      Horowitz does not expressly teach a program configured to track lot numbers.

Kall teaches to a program configured to track lot numbers (pg. 11, par. [0199] and Fig. 43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include a program configured to track lot numbers to provide basic tracking, genealogy and quality control of inventory and product (pg. 11, par. [0197]).

34.   As per claim 27, Horowitz does not expressly teach displaying messages to an operator via the operator interface regarding the identity and quantity of a next ingredient to be added.

Kall teaches to displaying messages to an operator via the operator interface regarding the identity and quantity of a next ingredient to be added (pg. 11, par. [0199] and Fig. 43).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include displaying messages to an operator via the operator interface regarding the identity and quantity of a next ingredient to be added to provide basic tracking, genealogy and quality control of inventory and product (pg. 11, par. [0197]).

35.   As per claim 28, Horowitz teaches tracking origin containers of those reconciled

ingredients that are controlled ingredients (col. 5, col. 32-33 and col. 6, lines 55-57).

       Horowitz does not expressly teach tracking lot numbers.

       Kall teaches to tracking lot numbers (pg. 11, par. [0199] and Fig. 43).

       Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include to

tracking lot numbers to provide basic tracking, genealogy and quality control of

inventory and product (pg. 11, par. [0197]).

36.   Claim 10 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Horowitz in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,536,494 (hereinafter Carter).

37.   As per claim 10, Horowitz does not expressly teach ingredients are added in a

descending order of quantity to be added to the batch.

       Cater teaches ingredients are added in a descending order of quantity to be

added to the batch (col. 6, lines 49-52).

       Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include

ingredients are added in a descending order of quantity to be added to the batch to

improve feed efficiency for treating animal feeds (col. 2, lines 30-34).

38.   As per claim 23, Horowitz does not expressly teach mapping ingredients to be added to the batch generally in an order of descending quantity.

        Cater teaches ingredients to be added to the batch generally in an order of descending quantity (col. 6, lines 49-52).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include ingredients to be added to the batch generally in an order of descending quantity to improve feed efficiency for treating animal feeds (col. 2, lines 30-34).

39.   Claim 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,272,824 (hereinafter Lewinger).

40.   As per claim 11, Horowitz does not expressly teach an ingredient is split if the quantity of the ingredient to be added to the batch is greater than an available volume in an empty transfer container.

        Lewinger teaches to the splitting (i.e. dividing) the quantity of an ingredient to be added to a batch (col. 4, lines 62-68, col. 5, lines 1-26 and col. 11-44).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include the splitting (i.e. dividing) the quantity of an ingredient to be added to a batch the blending

of the ingredients can be more accurately controlled for uniformity of the product (col.

1, lines 28-35).

41.   As per clam 24, Horowitz does not expressly teach splitting an ingredient if the

quantity of the ingredient to be added to the batch is greater than an available volume

in an empty transfer container.

Lewinger teaches to the splitting (i.e. dividing) the quantity of an ingredient to

be added to a batch (col. 4, lines 62-68, col. 5, lines 1-26 and col. 11-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to include the

splitting (i.e. dividing) the quantity of an ingredient to be added to a batch the blending

of the ingredients can be more accurately controlled for uniformity of the product (col.

1, lines 28-35).

42.   Claim 12 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Horowitz in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,815,042 (hereinafter Pratt).

43.   As per claim 12, Horowitz does not expressly teach stranded transfer containers

containing ingredients of the recipe are added to the batch.

Pratt teaches to stranded transfer containers containing ingredients of the recipe are added to the batch (col. 12, lines 64-68 and col. 13, line 1; i.e. a dumping process of containers containing ingredients that were not completely emptied).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to stranded transfer containers containing ingredients of the recipe are added to the batch to improve accuracy of concentrations (col. 21, lines 43-46).

44.   As per claim 25, Horowitz does not expressly teach adding stranded transfer containers containing ingredients of the recipe to the batch.

Pratt teaches adding stranded transfer containers containing ingredients of the recipe to the batch (col. 12, lines 64-68 and col. 13, line 1; i.e. a dumping process of containers containing ingredients that were not completely emptied).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Horowitz to adding stranded transfer containers containing ingredients of the recipe to the batch to improve accuracy of concentrations (col. 21, lines 43-46).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to a batch process.

U.S. Patent No. 3,959,636 discloses a batching system for operating each cycle of a batching process includes a communications bus to which are connected a basic processor, a control console, an analog/digital converter module, and an interface unit.

U.S. Patent No. 4,137,976 discloses batches are accumulated and released as required to deliver a total weight of material substantially equal to a desired package weight, while the actual delivered weights of successive batches are determined, registered and totaled.

U.S. Patent No. 4,661,917 discloses a mixing combinatorial counting and weighing method and apparatus for packaging a wide variety of articles in a single pack, wherein the numbers or ratio of the candies are designated.

U.S. Patent No. 4,771,836 discloses a combinational weighing system having at least three microcomputers in its control unit for monitoring weight data, driving the means for delivering the articles to be weighed, performing combinational computations and controlling the operation of the system.

U.S. Patent No. 4,889,433 discloses a method and apparatus whereby livestock and poultry are administered feed additives in their feed ration.

U.S. Patent No. 4,918,659 discloses a complete additive transport and mixing system is carried on a single vehicle.

U.S. Patent No. 5,240,324 discloses a system for combining, mixing, and further processing ingredients to produce a specified weight of a composition in accordance with a specified recipe.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER L. NORTON whose telephone number is (571)272-3694. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Albert DeCady/   Albert DeCady
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2121   Supervisory Patent Examiner
                                                        Art Unit 2121